

## Remarks

### Claim Status

Originally filed claims 1-18 were reviewed by the Examiner. Applicants thank the Examiner for thorough consideration given.

The Examiner rejected originally filed claims 1- 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Amendments to claims 1 and 11 are believed to provide proper antecedent basis.

In claim 7, the limitation of weight % in claim 7 narrows the range in claim 1, and is an independent element that cannot be disregarded. The narrower ranges can take into account other unspecified ingredients. Secondly, both requirements as to amounts in claim 1 and claim 7 must be followed to. Applicants are entitled to provide a specified arrangement where broader specified element of an independent claim places a limit on a particular range stated in a dependent claim. In other words it is not obligatory to follow the minimum amounts if to do so for the overall composition, a range inside would not be met in claim 1. That selection is merely outside the claims.

Originally filed claims 11 - 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Koshy. Applicants traverse on the basis that there is indeed a structure in the claimed dispensing system. That structure is a dispenser that delivers a specified ratio of the parts of a specified adhesive, neither of which are disclosed in Koshy as a whole. The part ratios of the adhesives taught instantly and in Koshy are listed below

	<u>Ratio of A to B</u>
Invention:	1: 1.4 to 1: 3.0
Koshy (Col. 9, line 23-24)	1.9: 1 to 2.7 : 1.

The dispenser can take on a variety of forms, however it is a critical package that delivers the adhesive. The claimed elements in the invention should be regarded as a whole. The structural feature of the restricted dispensing ratio should be taken together with the specified adhesive contents to define an adhesive delivery system. Claim 11 is patentable because the two recited structural features together represent a novel article and non-obvious features taken together. The dispenser is adapted to

deliver a ratio of parts A to B of from 1 : 1.4 to 1 : 3.0 of a particular adhesive. When the invention is used, it provides an adhesive that exhibits fiber tearing bonds after aging, and cures to a bond line that has improved lower read-through after exposure to paint-bake conditions. The dispenser and specified adhesive together provide critical elements shown to provide nonobvious results, when the invention is used.

Originally filed claims 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Abbey. This rejection is traversed on the basis that Abbey suggested a ratio of parts A to B of from 0.5:1 to 10:1. Abbey never arranged any adhesive in a dispenser delivering the ratio specified in claim 11. The specification shows result of meeting a number of important performance criteria, including fiber-tearing of SMC after water soak, low read-through, adhesive strength, to name a few, and is critically dependent on the dispenser mix ratio. At the mix ratio disclosed in Abbey, 1: 1.25, this results in unacceptable read-through. The dispenser and specified adhesive together provide critical elements shown to provide nonobvious results, taken in view of Abbey which illustrated an adhesive dispensed in a volume ratio of 1: 1.25. There was not teaching or suggestion or motivation, or expectation of improving the performance by selecting any particular adhesive and dispensing this adhesive in any particular mix ratio, save the mix ratio exemplified. With no teaching or direction to do what applicants have done, the claimed invention particularly points out patentably distinguishable features.

In light of the amendments and Remarks herein, Applicant submits that claims 1-18 as amended are patentably distinguished. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections and allowance of the amended claims 1-26 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

M. B. Dearth

M. B. Dearth

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 35,115

Cary, North Carolina 27512